

EPA Official Record

Notes ID: 3112880912725EB6852577DD006717F6

From: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US

To: "Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>

Copy To: "Fox, Steve \ (New Bedford\)" <Steve.Fox@jacobs.com>

Delivered Date: 04/14/2009 02:54 PM EDT

Subject: Re: Next Question: CAD Cell Capacities

Hi Anita,

I'm still playing phone tag with Man Chak about our discussion yesterday, so don't take this as final, but I think you're on the right track. But instead of taking the UHCC organics to offshore disposal, why not assume we'd dispose all of these into the LHCC (since our new volume to the LHCC is much lower...i.e we'd still be less than 300,000 cy total to the LHCC). So to answer your question, keep the LHCC around 300,000 (or whatever the new math works out to) but do lower the UHCC volume per the new volume balance.

It looks like you're applying the 10% extra to ALL DMU volumes?

I couldn't get the math to come out exactly as you show in the lower left. I think the problem is that "475,289 cy" should be "475,289 cy"

Thanks - Dave

▼ "Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>

| | | | |
|---|--|---------|--|
| "Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com> 04/14/2009 02:18 PM | | | |
| | | To | Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA |
| | | cc | "Fox, Steve \ (New Bedford\)" <Steve.Fox@jacobs.com> |
| | | Subject | Next Question: CAD Cell Capacities |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Hi Dave,

After our conversations yesterday, I worked through the volume calculations with the sequence of 2 more years of hydraulic dredging, build (City) LHCC, then build UHCC. It makes economical sense to dispose of the UH MU material into the UHCC and to dispose of the LH MU material (south of Coggeshall St. Bridge) into the LHCC. So, I assumed the following:

- 2 years (2009 and 2010) of hydraulic dredging with T&D disposal
- contaminated organics from construction of UHCC to LHCC [18,300 cy]
- material from MU33-37 to LHCC [167,031 cy]
- remaining (not dredged through 2010) material from MU1-24, -102, -105 to UHCC [115,796 cy]
- material from MU25-32 to UHCC [114,684 cy]

The attached spreadsheet shows the volume balance for the two CAD cells with the above assumptions. The effect of an extra year of hydraulic dredging results in too much capacity in the CAD cells.

For the purpose of the \$80M/year scenario, should I reduce the volume of the UHCC to something like 230K cy or 240K cy; and that for the LHCC to something like 190K cy?

Anita

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by



replying to the message and deleting it from your computer. Vol & Disp Assump_Apex Alt 1_2Cellrev0.xls